



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,458	12/13/2001	Luis M. Ortiz	1000-1086	4602
64064 7590 10/28/2008 ORTIZ & LOPEZ, PLLC P.O. BOX 4484 ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87196-4484				
EXAMINER				
YODER III, CHRIS S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2622				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,458

Applicant(s)

ORTIZ ET AL.

Examiner

CHRISS S. YODER III

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 127-175 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 127-175 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

The declaration and supplemental documentation filed on October 6, 2008 under 37 CFR 1.131 have been considered but are unsuccessful in overcoming the Hardacker reference (US PGPub. 2002/0115454).

Rule 131 (a) requires that the facts be offered which show "completion of the invention" prior to the effective date of the reference in order to establish prima facie a case of prior inventorship. The term "completion" is further defined by the requirement of subsection (b) of Rule 131 that the facts must establish either reduction to practice, or conception coupled with due diligence until an actual reduction to practice or the filing of the application. *In re Clarke*, 356 F.2d 987, 148 USPQ 665, 669 (C.C.P.A. 1966).

First, the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish conception prior to the February 20, 2001 effective date of the reference (the filing date of the Hardacker reference). According to MPEP Section 715.07, the essential thing to be shown under 37 CFR 1.131 is priority of invention and this may be done by any satisfactory evidence of the fact. FACTS, not conclusions, must be alleged. Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. Each exhibit relied upon should be specifically referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show. The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice

"amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). In re Borkowski, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974).

Conception is the mental part of the inventive act, but it must be capable of proof, as by drawings, complete disclosure to another person, etc. In Mergenthaler v. Scudder, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897), it was established that conception is more than a mere vague idea of how to solve a problem; the means themselves and their interaction must be comprehended also.

Specifically, a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must establish possession of either the whole invention claimed or something falling within the claim (such as a species of a claimed genus), in the sense that the claim as a whole reads on it. In re Tanczyn, 347 F.2d 830, 146 USPQ 298 (CCPA 1965). However, neither the declaration nor the supporting documents particularly describe or illustrate all of the claimed elements.

Additionally, in regard to Exhibit A (US Patent 7,149,549), there is no explanation of which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. And in regard to Exhibit B (news article dated July 2001), there is no proof, as by drawings, complete disclosure to another person, etc..

Consequently, Applicant fails to overcome the effective date of the Hardacker reference because Applicant has not affirmatively demonstrated conception by establishing possession of the invention claimed.

Second, the evidence submitted fails to establish either reduction to practice, or conception coupled with due diligence until a subsequent actual reduction to practice or the filing of the application.

MPEP Section 715.07 provides "A conception of an invention, though evidenced by disclosure, drawings, and even a model, is not a complete invention under the patent laws, and confers no rights on an inventor, and has no effect on a subsequently granted patent to another, UNLESS THE INVENTOR FOLLOWS IT WITH REASONABLE DILIGENCE BY SOME OTHER ACT, such as an actual reduction to practice or filing an application for a patent. *Automatic Weighing Mach. Co. v. Pneumatic Scale Corp.*, 166 F.2d 288, 1909 C.D. 498, 139 O.G. 991 (1st Cir. 1909)."

Therefore, assuming arguendo that Applicant conceived of the claimed invention prior to the February 20, 2001 U.S. filing date of Hardacker, Applicant has still failed to establish due diligence coupled with a conception.

Applicant has provided no chronology of events regarding or accounting for any time periods (gaps/lapses) between either Exhibit A or Exhibit B, and the subsequent actual reduction to practice or filing of the application (the present application, 10/015,458). MPEP section 2138.06 states that an applicant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required. *Gould v. Schawlow*, 363 F.2d 908, 919, 150 USPQ 634, 643 (CCPA 1966.) Section 2138.06 further provides that the period during which diligence is required must be accounted for by either affirmative acts or acceptable excuses. *Rebstock v. Flouret*, 191 USPQ 342, 345 (Bd. Pat. Inter. 1975); *Rieser v. Williams*, 225 F.2d 419, 423, 118 USPQ 96, 100 (CCPA 1958).

Consequently, Applicant fails to overcome the effective date of the Hardacker reference because neither the declaration nor the supplemental documentation establish facts necessary to demonstrate the required due diligence.

Based on the foregoing, in which Applicant has failed to demonstrate conception and/or due diligence, the previous grounds of rejection have been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. **Claims 127, 132-134, 138, 139, 143-145, 149-152, 156-157, 162-165, 169, 170, and 175 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hardacker (US PGPub. 2002/0115454).**

2. In regard to **claim 127**, note Hardacker discloses a method for transmitting venue-based in-play camera views for display at authorized hand held device (paragraph 0017), said method comprising the steps of transmitting in-play camera views from at least one in-play camera located at an in-play camera location within an entertainment venue for viewing by handheld devices located within the entertainment

venue and authorized to receive and process said in-play camera view (paragraphs 0017-0018), processing said in-play camera view for display on displays associated with said hand held devices located within said entertainment venue and authorized to receive and process said in-play camera view (paragraph 0024), and enabling display of said in-play camera view on said displays (paragraph 0020).

3. In regard to **claim 132**, note Hardacker discloses that said in-play camera location comprises a placement within a race car competing within a racing venue (paragraph 0018).

4. In regard to **claim 133**, note Hardacker discloses that said venue comprises a racetrack (paragraph 0018).

5. In regard to **claim 134**, note Hardacker discloses a method of providing video entertainment comprising the steps of capturing at least one in-play camera view from at least one in-play camera located within a race car competing within a car racing venue for viewing by at least one handheld device located within the racing venue and authorized to receive and process said in-play camera view (paragraphs 0017-0018), processing said at least one in-play camera view for display on a display associated with a hand held device authorized to receive and process said at least one in-play camera view and physically located within said racing venue (paragraph 0024), transmitting said at least one in-play camera view to at least one handheld device located within the racing venue and authorized to receive and process said at least one in-play camera view (paragraphs 0017-0018), and displaying said at least one in-play camera view on a display associated with at least one hand held device physically

located within said racing venue and authorized to receive, process and display at least one in-play camera view (paragraph 0020).

6. In regard to **claim 138**, note Hardacker discloses a method for transmitting venue-based in-play camera views for display at a hand held device authorized to receive venue-based in-play camera views (paragraph 0017), said method comprising the steps of transmitting in-play camera views captured from at least one in-play camera located at an in-play camera location within an entertainment venue to enterprise equipment located at the entertainment venue (paragraphs 0017-0018), processing said in-play camera views at said enterprise equipment for secure transmission to at least one hand held device authorized with at least one security code to receive and display video on a display screen associated with said at least one hand held device (paragraphs 0023-0024), and securely transmitting processed in-play camera views to at least one hand held device authorized with at least one security code to receive and display video on a display screen associated with said at least one hand held device (paragraphs 0023-0024).

7. In regard to **claim 139**, note Hardacker discloses receiving processed in-play camera views at a hand held device authorized with at least one security code to receive and display video on a display screen associated with said hand held device (paragraphs 0017 & 0023), processing said in-play camera views for viewing on a display associated with said hand held device (paragraph 0024), and displaying said processed in-play camera views on the display screen associated with said hand held device (paragraphs 0017-0018 & 0024).

8. In regard to **claim 143**, note Hardacker discloses that said in-play camera location comprises a placement within a race car competing within a racing venue (paragraph 0018).
9. In regard to **claim 144**, note Hardacker discloses that said venue comprises a racetrack (paragraph 0018).
10. In regard to **claim 145**, note Hardacker discloses a method for receiving venue-based in-play camera views by a hand held device authorized by at least one security code to receive in-play camera views and adapted to display in-play camera views (paragraphs 0017 & 0023) , said method comprising the steps of receiving in-play camera views provided from at least one in-play camera at a hand held device authorized by at least one security code to receive said in-play camera views (paragraphs 0017-0024), processing said in-play camera views for viewing on a display associated with said hand held device authorized by at least one security code to receive said in-play camera views (paragraphs 0023-0024), and displaying said processed in-play camera view on a display screen associated with said hand held device, thereby enabling hand held device users to view said in-play camera views through said hand held device authorized by at least one security code to receive said in-play camera views (paragraph 0026).
11. In regard to **claim 149**, note Hardacker discloses that said in-play camera location comprises a placement within a race car competing within a racing venue (paragraph 0018).

12. In regard to **claim 150**, note Hardacker discloses that said venue comprises a racing venue (paragraph 0018).

13. In regard to **claim 151**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a system for securely transmitting venue-based in-play camera views to wireless hand held devices authorized to receive and process said venue-based in-play camera views (paragraph 0017), said system comprising transmitter adapted to securely transmit at least one in-play camera view from at least one in-play camera located at an in-play location within a live entertainment venue to wireless hand held devices authorized to receive and process venue-based in-play camera views (paragraphs 0017-0018), and processor for processing said in-play camera view for secure transmission by said transmitter to wireless hand held devices authorized to receive, process and display venue-based in-play camera views on a display associated with said wireless hand held devices (paragraph 0024).

14. In regard to **claim 152**, note Hardacker discloses the use of wireless hand held devices located within said entertainment venue and adapted to securely receive at least one in-play camera view transmitted by said transmitter and to process said at least one in-play camera view for display on at least one display associated with said wireless hand held devices (paragraphs 0017-0018).

15. In regard to **claim 156**, note Hardacker discloses that at least one in-play camera is located within a race car competing within a racing venue (paragraph 0018).

16. In regard to **claim 157**, note Hardacker discloses that said live entertainment venue further comprises a racetrack (paragraph 0018).

17. In regard to **claim 164**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a system for securely transmitting entertainment venue-based in-play camera views for display at wireless hand held devices authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views (paragraph 0017), said system comprising enterprise equipment including a processor and transmitter (paragraphs 0017 & 0024), said enterprise equipment adapted to securely transmit entertainment venue-based in-play camera views captured by at least one in-play camera located at the entertainment venue to wireless hand held devices authorized to receive, process and display said entertainment venue-based in-play camera views (paragraphs 0017-0018).

18. In regard to **claim 165**, note Hardacker discloses that the system further comprises at least one wireless hand held device authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views and located in said entertainment venue (paragraphs 0017-0018), said at least one hand held device including a display for displaying said processed in-play camera views (paragraph 0020), a receiver for securely receiving processed in-play camera views (paragraph 0017), and a processor for processing said in-play camera views for display on a display included with said at least one hand held device (paragraph 0024).

19. In regard to **claim 169**, note Hardacker discloses that said enterprise equipment is located in a racetrack (paragraph 0018).

20. In regard to **claim 170**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a system for receiving entertainment venue-based in-play camera views for display at wireless hand held devices authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based

in-play camera views (paragraphs 0017-0018), said system comprising a receiver in a wireless hand held device authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views, said receiver adapted for securely receiving in-play camera views provided from at least one in-play camera located at an entertainment venue (paragraph 0017), a processor in said wireless hand held device authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views, said processor adapted for processing said in-play camera views securely received by said receiver with an authorization code for secure viewing of said in-play camera views on a display associated with said hand held device authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views (paragraphs 0023-0024), and display in said wireless hand held device authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views, said display adapted for displaying said in-play camera views processed by said processor (paragraphs 0017-0024).

21. In regard to **claim 175**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a live video entertainment system for securely transmitting entertainment venue-based in-play camera views to hand held devices authorized by a security code to receive and process said venue-based in-play camera views for display at the hand held devices (paragraphs 0017 & 0023), said system comprising at least one in-play camera for capturing at least one in-play camera view from at least one in-play camera (paragraph 0017), a processing means for processing said at least one in-play camera view for secure transmission to at least one wireless hand held device for display on said at

least one hand held device (paragraph 0024), a wireless transmission means for securely transmitting said at least one in-play camera view to at least one wireless hand held device (paragraph 0017), and at least one wireless hand held device authorized by at least one security code to receive and display said at least one in-play camera view (paragraphs 0017-0024).

22. In regard to **claim 162**, note Hardacker discloses that said in-play camera location comprises a placement within a race car competing within a racetrack (paragraph 0018).

23. In regard to **claim 163**, note Hardacker discloses that said live entertainment venue further comprises a racetrack (paragraph 0018).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. **Claims 128-131, 135-137, 140-142, 146-148, 153-155, 158-161, 166-168, and 171-174 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardacker (US PGPub. 2002/0115454) in view of Narayanaswami (US Patent 6,657,654).**

25. In regard to **claim 128**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a method for transmitting venue-based in-play camera views for display at authorized hand held device, as claimed in claim 127 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to

disclose the step of recording a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera in response to user input at a hand held device.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker method to include the step of recording a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera in response to user input at a hand held device in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

26. In regard to **claim 129**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a method for transmitting venue-based in-play camera views for display at authorized hand held device, as claimed in claim 127 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose the step of storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera in response to user input at a hand held device.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker method to include the step of storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera in response to user input at a hand held device in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

27. In regard to **claim 130**, note Narayanaswami discloses that the step of recording a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera further comprises the step of storing said particular in-play camera view within a memory in said hand held device (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

28. In regard to **claim 131**, note the primary reference of Hardacker in view of Narayanaswami discloses the use of a method for transmitting venue-based in-play camera views for display at authorized hand held device, as claimed in claim 128 above. Therefore, it can be seen that the primary reference fails to disclose that said particular in-play camera view comprises an instant replay. Official notice is taken that the concepts and advantages of using instant replay in video are notoriously well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the primary method to use a camera view that comprises an instant replay in order to highlight specific events (e.g. an important play in a sporting event).

29. In regard to **claim 135**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a method of providing video entertainment comprising the steps of capturing at least one in-play camera view from at least one in-play camera located within a race car competing within a car racing venue for viewing by at least one handheld device located within the racing venue and authorized to receive and process said in-play camera view, as claimed in claim 134 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose the step of recording a particular in-play camera view captured by said at least one in-play camera within a hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker method to include the step of recording a particular in-play camera view captured by said at least one in-play camera within a hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

30. In regard to **claim 136**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a method of providing video entertainment comprising the steps of capturing at least one in-play camera view from at least one in-play camera located within a race car competing within a car racing venue for viewing by at least one handheld device located within the racing venue and authorized to receive and process said in-play camera view, as claimed in claim 134 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose the step of storing a particular in-play camera view captured by said at least one in-play camera by a hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker method to include the step of storing a particular in-play camera view captured by said at least one in-play camera by a hand held device in response to

a user input at said hand held device in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

31. In regard to **claim 137**, note Narayanaswami discloses that the step of storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera further comprises the step of storing said particular in-play camera view within a memory in said hand held device (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

32. In regard to **claim 140**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a method for transmitting venue-based in-play camera views for display at a hand held device authorized to receive venue-based in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 138 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose the step of recording a particular in-play camera received by said hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker method to include the step of recording a particular in-play camera received by said hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

33. In regard to **claim 141**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a method for transmitting venue-based in-play camera views for display at a hand held device

authorized to receive venue-based in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 138 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose the step of storing a particular in-play camera received by said hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker method to include the step of storing a particular in-play camera received by said hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

34. In regard to **claim 142**, note Narayanaswami discloses storing said particular in-play camera view within a memory in said hand held device (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

35. In regard to **claim 146**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a method for receiving venue-based in-play camera views by a hand held device authorized by at least one security code to receive in-play camera views and adapted to display in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 145 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose the step of recording a particular in-play camera received by said hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly

known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker method to include the step of recording a particular in-play camera received by said hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

36. In regard to **claim 147**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a method for receiving venue-based in-play camera views by a hand held device authorized by at least one security code to receive in-play camera views and adapted to display in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 145 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose the step of storing a particular in-play camera received by said hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker method to include the step of storing a particular in-play camera received by said hand held device in response to a user input at said hand held device in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

37. In regard to **claim 148**, note Narayanaswami discloses storing said particular in-play camera view within storage media in said hand held device (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

38. In regard to **claim 153**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a system for securely transmitting venue-based in-play camera views to wireless hand held devices authorized to receive and process said venue-based in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 151 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose a recorder for recording a particular in-play camera view transmitted by said transmitter and received by said wireless hand held devices in response to a user input at said wireless hand held devices.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker device to include the use of a recorder for recording a particular in-play camera view transmitted by said transmitter and received by said wireless hand held devices in response to a user input at said wireless hand held devices in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

39. In regard to **claim 154**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a system for securely transmitting venue-based in-play camera views to wireless hand held devices authorized to receive and process said venue-based in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 151 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose a storage media for storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted by said transmitter and received by said wireless hand held devices in response to a user input at said wireless hand held devices.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker device to include the use of a storage media for storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted by said transmitter and received by said wireless hand held devices in response to a user input at said wireless hand held devices in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

40. In regard to **claim 155**, note Narayanaswami discloses that said storage media further comprises a memory location (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

41. In regard to **claim 158(second)**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a live video entertainment system for securely transmitting entertainment venue-based in-play camera views to hand held devices authorized by a security code to receive and process said venue-based in-play camera views for display at the hand held devices, as claimed in claim 175 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose a recorder for recording a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera, in response to a user input.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

modify the Hardacker device to include the use of a recorder for recording a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera, in response to a user input in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

42. In regard to **claim 159**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a live video entertainment system for securely transmitting entertainment venue-based in-play camera views to hand held devices authorized by a security code to receive and process said venue-based in-play camera views for display at the hand held devices, as claimed in claim 175 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose a storage mechanism for storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera, in response to a user input.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker device to include the use of a storage mechanism for storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera, in response to a user input in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

43. In regard to **claim 160**, note Narayanaswami discloses that said storage mechanism comprises a memory location (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

44. In regard to **claim 161**, note Narayanaswami discloses that said memory location further comprises storage media (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

45. In regard to **claim 166**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a system for securely transmitting entertainment venue-based in-play camera views for display at wireless hand held devices authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 165 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose that said at least one wireless hand held device further comprises a storage mechanism for storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera in response to a user input.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker device to include a storage mechanism for storing a particular in-play camera view transmitted from said at least one in-play camera in response to a user input in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

46. In regard to **claim 167**, note Narayanaswami discloses that said storage mechanism further comprises a memory location (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

47. In regard to **claim 168**, note the primary reference of Hardacker in view of Narayanaswami discloses the use of a system for securely transmitting entertainment

venue-based in-play camera views for display at wireless hand held devices authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 167 above. Therefore, it can be seen that the primary reference fails to disclose that said memory location comprises removable storage media.

Official Notice is taken that the concepts and advantages of using a removable storage media are notoriously well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the primary device of Hardacker in view of Narayanaswami to include the use of a removable storage media in order to allow image data to be transferred from one device to another without having to connect multiple devices, as well as to provide an expandable storage capacity by allowing the user to replace the storage media when it is full.

48. In regard to **claim 171**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a system for receiving entertainment venue-based in-play camera views for display at wireless hand held devices authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 170 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose a recorder adapted to record a particular in-play camera view received by said wireless hand held device in response to a user input.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker device to include the use of a recorder adapted to record a

particular in-play camera view received by said wireless hand held device in response to a user input in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

49. In regard to **claim 172**, note Hardacker discloses the use of a system for receiving entertainment venue-based in-play camera views for display at wireless hand held devices authorized to receive, process and display the entertainment venue-based in-play camera views, as claimed in claim 170 above. Therefore, it can be seen that Hardacker fails to disclose a storage mechanism adapted to store a particular in-play camera view received by said wireless hand held device in response to a user input.

In analogous art, Narayanaswami disclose the use of a handheld device that records data that is received from a camera (column 5, lines 45-47). It is commonly known in the art to record a video source in order to allow the user to playback the video at a later time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardacker device to include the use of a storage mechanism adapted to store a particular in-play camera view received by said wireless hand held device in response to a user input in order allow the user to replay the video at a later time.

50. In regard to **claim 173**, note Narayanaswami discloses that said storage mechanism comprises a memory location (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

51. In regard to **claim 174**, note Narayanaswami discloses that said memory location comprises storage media (column 5, lines 45-47; the camera view is stored in memory 210).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US007124425B1: note the use of a hand-held display device receiving multiple video streams.

US005953056A: note the use of a video capture/display system for sport events.

US006073171A: note the use of two way video distribution.

US 20010042105: note the use of a display system that receiving multiple video streams.

US 20020069419A1: note the use of a video-on-demand system.

US006728518B1: note the use of an activation code in a hand-held device.

US007162532B2: note the use of a display system that receiving multiple video streams.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISS S. YODER III whose telephone number is (571)272-7323. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. S. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2622

/Lin Ye/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622